

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the following comments. Claims 1-33 are currently pending.

Claims 1-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hinrichs et al. (USPN 4,515,545) in view of Lee et al. (USPN 5,032,525) and Kenney et al. (USPN 6,445,969). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 1, 10, and 19 include the feature of “a system comprising elements for the control from a remote location of at least one discrete measurable operational parameter of a molding fluid or fiber in a manufacturing process”. The Examiner concedes that Hinrichs fails to disclose one or more manufacturing processes being controlled remotely, but alleges that Kenney discloses this element. In response, Applicants assert that Kenney fails to cure the deficiencies of Hinrichs.

Specifically, the Examiner alleges that Kenney teaches “a real time process control system for a manufacturing process that controls the process of a plurality of manufacturing facilities located at the same or different sites remotely.” However, contrary to the Examiner’s view, Applicants point out that no remote “control” function is disclosed by Kenney. Kenney discloses “a method and system, or network, for interconnecting multiple, remotely located, PCB manufacturing sites such that these remotely located processes may be monitored in a coordinated fashion.” See col. 2, lines 12-15 (emphasis added). Kenney discloses that the system “can notify manufacturing and/or engineering personnel of pending problems, or lack thereof, on a real-time basis.” See col. 2, lines 8-10. Thus, Kenney discloses functions consistent with remote monitoring, such as data acquisition, analysis, and notification, but fails to disclose control functions. See col. 1, lines 55-58.

Applicants assert that the ability to monitor disclosed by Kenney stands in sharp contrast to the ability to control as featured in claims 1, 10, and 19. Specifically, claim 1 is directed to “a system comprising elements for the control from a remote location of at least one discrete measurable operational parameter of a molding fluid or fiber in a manufacturing process for manufacturing composite articles at two or more manufacturing locations” (emphasis added).

Claim 10 is directed to "a system comprising elements for the control from a remote location of at least one discrete measurable operational parameter of a molding fluid or fiber in a manufacturing process for manufacturing a fiber reinforced thermoset product at two or more manufacturing locations" (emphasis added). Finally, claim 19 is directed to "a system comprising elements for the control from a remote location of at least one discrete measurable operational parameter of a molding fluid or fiber in a manufacturing process for reheating thermoplastic at two or more manufacturing locations" (emphasis added). Therefore, at least because the system of Kenney cannot control at least one discrete measurable operational parameter of a molding fluid or fiber in a manufacturing process, Kenney fails to cure the deficiencies of Hinrichs.


Lee also fails to cure the deficiencies of Hinrichs and Kenney. Lee is directed to an on-site temperature/pressure controller for an autoclave. However, Lee fails to disclose "a system comprising elements for the control from a remote location of at least one discrete measurable operational parameter of a molding fluid or fiber in a manufacturing process" as featured in claims 1, 10, and 19. Therefore, the combination of Hinrichs, Lee, and Kenney Lee fails to teach or suggest every element of claims 1, 10, and 19.

At least for these reasons, the combination of Hinrichs, Lee, and Kenney fails to render claims 1, 10, and 19 obvious. As claims 2-9 and 28-29 are dependent on claim 1, claims 11-18 and 30-31 are dependent on claim 10, and claims 20-27 and 32-33 are dependent on claim 19, they are also not rendered obvious. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

8/11/05  
Date

  
Mark E. Deffner  
Reg. No. 55,103  
Merchant & Gould P.C.  
P. O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

MED:kf

